DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 279 628 SP 028 612

AUTHOR Driscoll, Amy; Strouse, Joan
TITLE Portland State University's Cooperative Professional Education Program Model.
PUB DATE Feb 86
NOTE 20p.; Paper presented at the First Pacific Northwest Conference of the National Social Science Association (Seattle, WA, February 13-15, 1986).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Beginning Teachers; *College School Cooperation; Higher Education; Internship Programs; *Preservice Teacher Education; *Program Development; Program Evaluation; Teacher Placement
IDENTIFIERS *Cooperative Professional Education Program

ABSTRACT

Educational reform recommendations have often focused upon clinical experiences for preservice teachers and the induction phase of teaching. Portland State University (Oregon), in collaboration with Beaverton and Portland School Districts, has developed a Cooperative Professional Education Program (CPEP) which addresses these recommendations in an internship of combined coursework and clinical experiences with extension to beginning teaching placements. Rather than viewing the preservice phase of teacher education as the primary responsilibity of the college, and beginning teacher induction as the responsibility of the public schools with minimum involvement of institutions of higher education, the CPEP combines the two phases into a continuum of teacher education. Some of the benefits include: bringing additional training and retraining experiences to the public schools; more instructional personnel in contact with students; and direct involvement of public school personnel in the professional responsibility of improved and extended clinical preparation of potential teachers. This paper presents an overview of the CPEP, discusses its salient features, and offers an evaluation of the program's strengths and potentialities. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED279628

Portland State University's Cooperative Professional Education Program Model

Amy Driscoll

Joan Strouse

Portland State University

Paper Presented at the First Pacific NW Conference of the National Social Science Association, Feb. 13-15, 1986, Seattle, Washington

SP 028 612

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

A. Driscoll

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Introduction

As public attention to quality of education heightens, talk of teacher education reform arises from within and outside the profession (Warren, 1985). Forces outside teacher education institutions are demanding more public school participation in and accountability for the process of teacher education (Clinton, 1985). From within the institutions have come reform recommendations most often focused on clinical experiences (Joyce & Clift, 1984) and the induction phase (Lortie, 1975; Griffin, 1984). Portland State University, in collaboration with Beaverton and Portland School Districts, has developed a Cooperative Professional Education Program (CPEP) which addresses these recommendations in an internship of combined coursework and clinical experiences with extension to beginning teaching placements.

Clinical Experience Perspectives

At a time when field experiences are the major commonality in teacher education programs, tremendous confusion exists about the effects of such experiences (Fuller & Brown, 1960; Howey, 1977; Zeichner, 1980). A critical concern supported by researh findings (Lortie, 1975; Zeichner, 1980; Zimpher, deVoss & Nott, 1980) is the phenomenon whereby clinical experiences "wash out" the idealisms, concern for individual students, and knowledge and philosophies gained from education methods coursework. Zeichner (1980) called the replacement a "utilitarian perspective" and it is characterized by concerns with "what works" especially in the areas of classroom management and student achievement. The intensity of this phenomenon is moderated by the structure and environment of the clinical experience - the length of experience, location of the school, and the

school and classroom climate - as well as the cooperating teacher, university supervisor and clinical seminars.

With the cautions of Zeichner and his associates in view, most teacher educators continue to look to an extended clinical experience to remedy the gaps and limitations of the traditional brief student teaching assignment. Portland State University's CPEP experiment has broadened the field experience element of teacher preparation with an internship experience which commences the week before public school opens and ends with school closing. An additional unique characteristic of CPEP is the presentation of traditional methods coursework in non-traditional formats throughout the year of internship. Weekly seminars, weekend workshops and late afternoon inservice provide content for the accompanying daily practice. With concurrent learning and experience, there may be a different phenomenon occurring in the socialization of Portland State University's CPEP students.

Induction Phase Perspectives

Professionals studying the development of teachers have described the induction phase or beginning years of teaching as a "survival phase" (Katz, 1980; Fuller,1969). Accompanying the current reform movement previously described is a concentration of research and development of mentor programs for beginning teachers (Driscoll, Kauchak & Peterson, 1985), supervised internships (Koehler, 1985; Griffin, 1984), and more thoughtful approaches to inservice for teachers (Sparks, 1983). These efforts are generally aimed at moving beginning teachers from Zeichner's "utilitarian perspective" to a more thoughtful approach to their work. Hall and Loucks (1978) described the desired change as one from concerns about survival (books and

materials, dress, getting through the day), to concerns about curriculum, individual students, and professional development.

Prior to the current reform movement, the preservice phase of teacher education has been viewed as the primary responsibility of institutions of higher education with minimal involvement of public schools in the clinical experience. Likewise the induction phase of teacher education has been viewed as the primary responsibility of public schools with less than minimal involvement of institutions of higher education. The realization that neither process has been as effective as desired, and the exhortations of professionals studying the entire continuum of teacher education (Howey & Gardner, 1984) for collaborative efforts have resulted in innovations such as the Cooperative Professional Education Program (CPEP) to be described.

Portland State University's Response

Portland State University and the Beaverton and Portland Public School Districts began collaboration in an experimental program to prepare outstanding beginning teachers in 1981. It is a cooperative field-based teacher education program with a commitment to both urban and suburban education in the Portland area. The project is in conformance with both school districts' goals of improving the educational effectiveness of the schools. Some of the benefits include: bringing additional training and retraining experiences to the public schools; more instructional personnel in contact with students; direct involvement of public school personnel in the professional responsibility of improved and extended clinical preparation of potential teachers; a full year of clinical experiences; a shared opportunity for Portland State University and school districts to apply educational theory to practical situations and to try out and practice

instructional strategies; and an enhanced collaboration between institutions of higher education and public schools (Carl, 1985).

The Cooperative Professional Education Program (CPEP) was initiated in the Beaverton School District three years ago and in the Portland Public Schools in 1985. Both districts have been involved with P. S. U. in all aspects of development. These included: program design and description; recruitment and selection of student candidates and supervisory public school teachers; support teams; individualized learning plans; monitoring and documentation of student progress; and ongoing planning and evaluation of the program progress.

During the last year two major investigations of the CPEP model have been and are being conducted. The first examined the impact of the CPEP experience on the induction phase of teacher development. The initial study included questionnaire and interview data on the following issues: CPEP graduates' perceptions of their performance as first year teachers; CPEP graduates' concerns as first year teachers; CPEP graduates' supervisors' perceptions of their first year teaching; and CPEP graduates' reflections on the CPEP program after one year of teaching. The second investigation focuses on the socialization of preservice teachers by means of an interview study which is sampling student teachers in a traditional program and interns in the CPEP program. This study will examine the impact of both school district placement and type of clinical experience on the teaching thoughts of preservice teachers for evidence of the "utilitarian perspective" previously described or for alternative perspectives resulting from non-traditional experiences. Interview questions also focus on research awareness, rationale for instructional decisions, professional efficacy and concerns, multicultural and gender sensitivity and

self-evaluation for implications for continuing teacher education program development.

CPEP Program Overview

Program Development

Since 1981 local school district personnel and the PSU School of Education faculty have been meeting to discuss the preparation of teachers. The early meetings were stimulated by a report from the Oregon Joint Committee on Teacher Education that produced a position paper entitled, Toward Excellence in Oregon Education (1982). That report, like many others of its kind, chronicled the need to strengthen cooperation between teacher training institutions and local educational school districts in the selection and training of prospective teachers.

Many sub groups, with personnel from the school district and university, met throughout the spring to organize and plan for the proposed program. Student candidates for the program were also selected and they were in place in the Beaverton Schools at the start of the 1982-83 school year.

Throughout the project, from it's earliest conception, there has always been cooperative planning by personnel from both the school district and Portland State University. This seems to have resulted in mutual responsibility and ownership of the program and also kept the CPEP project true to the spirit to which it was intended.

The initial portion of the CPEP project was designed to be an alternative route to more traditional teacher prepatation. This preparation for teachers was set up as either a 4 or 5 year teacher preparation program. Students who, early in their academic training, targeted themselves for a career in education were able to obtain a

baccalaureate degree as well as a basic Oregon teaching certificate. Students who entered the program already holding a baccalaureate degree were still able to enter the CPEP program and exit with a basic Oregon teaching certificate.

The CPEP program always has had as its mission the goal of developing professional programs that would produce outstanding first year teachers. To reach that lofty goal the program was very careful to assign students to model classroom teachers who would be able to serve as "mentors" to PSU students. The students are also assigned a PSU coordinator who would be able to serve as "support" for both the student and the teacher. Personnel from both the school district and PSU would also be available for instructional seminars for students. Each student would be assigned a support team comprised of the support teacher, the building principal (who chairs the team), the PSU coordinator, and the student's university supervisor. A cooperative planning group would also meet regularly to insure that the program is monitored through the year. That group is comprised of building principals, the PSU curriculum and administration department head (who chairs the group), and the PSU Director of Field Services and Certification.

Program Philosophy

The design of the cooperative program has, at its core, many notions about how students learn to teach and that they can demonstrate their progress and competence.

First, learning to teach can take place in a variety of settings.

Second, learning requires the input and activities of both university and school district personnel for short and long term activities.

Third, students are fully involved by making an entire-year commitment to the program. Careful selection of candidates is vital to ensure this component of the program.

Fourth, modeling by competent, skilled teachers is essential to the success of the program. Therefore, cooperating classroom teacher selection is done carefully and assignments are made on the basis of demonstrated expertise.

Last, learning requires access to the best resources available by pooling talent from PSU and the district.

Individualized Learning Plan

The Individualized Learning Plan (ILP) is a primary tool developed for each CPEP student intern to insure that performance standards otherwise met in traditional methods coursework are achieved. Beyond the performance check, the ILP serves as a guide for each student's professional growth. The knowledge, skills and attitudes reflected in the ILP were collaboratively developed by Portland State University and the school districts. Student intern progress and completion of the ILP is monitored and documented by a support team composed of representatives of both insititutions.

An ILP focuses on objectives that parallel those being taught in the traditional teacher preparation program. The programs vary for elementary and secondary education, but combine theory, content area information, current research, diagnosis, planning, evaluation, human relations, classroom management, elements of instruction, technology and professional development into objectives and enabling activities (See Appendix for sample ILP's). Additional characteristics of the ILP include: learning which is not limited to one classroom but extended to a wide variety of settings; activities of varied duration according to

student need; availability of resources from both insititutions to aid learning; and flexibility and individualization on the part of the student intern in completing the ILP. The process of developing the Individualized Learning Plan is one with important considerations and implications for both the clinical experience and induction phase of teacher education. Koehler (1985) has written persuasively about the complexities of classroom teaching and the impossibility of mastering the needed skills if one is isolated from the context of extended direct experience coupled with guidance and feedback. The process of developing and completing an ILP is an innovative and feasible response to the concern of Koehler and others.

The Support Team

The key to the success of the CPEP program is the support team which is made up of the university supervisor, the support teacher, and the building principal. These people all have a major part in the responsibility of the program. As part of their duties they meet regularly, participate in the development and writing of the ILP, coordinate academic instructional activities, assess and monitor student progress, write performance and placement evaluation,and select support personnel.

Student Selection and Placement

In the spring of the preceeding year, those considering applying to the CPEP program apply for admission to the program. They must meet the stated Portland State University admission guidleines and be within a year of completing their PSU program. Applications are reviewed and screened and finalists are interviewed by a panel at PSU. The panel looks for students who are self-motivated, possess good communication skills, are receptive to innovative ideas, are flexible,

can learn independently, and have good problem-solving skills. Based on written and oral evaluations, PSU then recommends a placement.

After candidates are selected by PSU, they are interviewed by school district personnel. The building principal, mentor teacher, and central office staff meet and after talking to the student, make a determination as to the appropriateness of the candidate. Once the candidate has been selected, notified, and placed in a building there is an informal introductory welcome meeting between the student and the cooperating classroom teacher.

Students are, when possible, clustered with one or more other intern(s) in the same school to provide for additional support. The students' transportation and personal needs are also considered when making placements.

School and Principal Selection

In selecting suitable schools in which to place student interns a variety of selection criteria are used. Because the CPEP model tries to cluster students, it is essential that buildings that are selected have several potential support teachers already on the staff. The principal plays a key role in the program, so he or she must by committed to the CPEP program philosophically and must be able to demonstrate an interest in improving teaching and learning. That principal must also be innovative and supportive and willing to commit time and resources to the program.

Support Teacher Selection

Any interested teacher may apply to become a mentor support teacher after seeking a recommendation from the building principal. Applicants are then screened by a selection team consisting of a student intern, the PSU coordinator, and either the elementary or

secondary PSU curriculum coordinator. Naturally the program seeks to get flexible, creative, supportive, and talented participants who are able to give of their talents, time, and supervisory skills to become an integral part of the program on a daily basis.

Future CPEP Development

The preservice teacher preparation component of CPEP constitutes a first phase of its development. The second phase is currently in the planning stages. Portland State University faculty and school district representatives have been reviewing current literature on teacher induction as well as studying available models of support for beginning teachers. The goal of both the study and discussion is a plan for CPEP extension of support, supervision and instruction to beginning teaching placements. Both university and school districts have a commitment to this second CPEP phase and have pledged time, resources and personnel to both planning and implementation.

CPEP Beginning Teacher Study

In 1985 Portland State University and Beaverton School District conducted a follow-up study of eight CPEP graduates who were completing their first year of teaching (Carl & Montgomery, 1985). Data for the study was generated by the use of three questionnaire forms and structured interviews. The questionnaires included the First Year Teacher Assessment Form which was completed by supervisors (administrators or building principals responsible for evaluating the first year teachers) and the First Year Teacher Self Assessment Form and Concerns of First Year Teachers Form completed by the CPEP graduates. A structured interview of each CPEP graduate and each supervisor was scheduled and conducted.

Data from this evaluative study demonstrates that CPEP achieves

its goal to prepare "outstanding beginning teachers" according to ratings of supervisors and graduates themselves. There is further indication that CPEP graduates possess important professional skills not ordinarily observed in beginning teachers. The areas of planning, subject matter knowledge and classroom management all received ratings higher than those usually given to novice teachers by supervisors. The concerns expressed by the CPEP graduates did not parallel those usually expressed by beginning teachers; their concerns reflected a professional thinking beyond the level documented as characteristic of the induction phase. CPEP graduates were least concerned with establishing relations with other faculty, enlisting assistance from administrators, locating resources and managing extra responsibilities. The areas of greatest concern were organization of work and student motivation, concerns often expressed by experienced teachers (Driscoll & Shirey, 1985). Unlike most beginning teachers, CPEP graduates responded that classroom management, beginning of school, establishing relationships with students and knowledge of subject matter had not posed great difficulty for them. Time constraints seemed to be a universal problem for the group but again most experienced teachers describe a similar problem. Finally CPEP first year teachers expressed a confidence in their readiness for first year teacher responsibilities; most talked of their preparation as appropriate for the demands faced in teaching. With a consideration of the limitations of the evaluative study, one can examine the findings for important questions and concerns for extended clinical experiences in teacher education. Discussion of these aspects will provide insight for additional development of CPEP and future innovations in teacher education. The data are currently providing direction for revision of

the teacher preparation component currently in place and for initiation of the induction phase component.

Comparison of Clinical Placement Study

Faculty from Portland State University are currently completing a study which examines the impact of both school district placement and type of clinical experience on the teaching thoughts of preservice teachers. Subjects include those completing a traditional ten week student teaching experience with placement in suburban neighborhood schools and in inner city schools and those in the year long CPEP internship in parallel school settings. Interviews of the subjects were conducted and taped using a protocol developed by study personnel. The interview questions probed preservice teacher thinking with respect to level of professional concerns, sense of efficacy, knowledge of research in the profession, awareness of and sensitivity to gender and ethnic diversity, and self-evaluation. Interview data will be coded into teacher thinking categories as suggested by the work of Buchmann (1980), and Driscoll, Kauchak and Stevens (1986). At this time, interviews are being transcribed for coding and analysis. Data from the interviews will be used as formative evaluation of the teacher preparation component of CPEP and for insights in planning te induction component.

Summary and Implications

This report contains a series of summary discussions for the purpose of description and beginning analysis of an innovation. The investigations described are primarily for formative evaluation purposes and are intended to inform both the CPEP and similar programs and developments in teacher education. This paper examines the Cooperative Professional Education Program for advantages and

disadvantages, and for characteristics of the model. The program has transportable elements which would assist future teacher education innovations but these must be considered with caution. Other teacher education programs may incorporate an extended internship, alternatives to traditional coursework, and individualization of preparation, but considerations of quality supervision and teacher models, monitoring of student progress and drection, and collaboration for support, resources and evaluation are essential accompaniments to program changes.

A major recommendation from Portland State University's CPEP is the importance of evaluation accompanying implementation. There is a commitment on the part of both the university and the school districts to study the CPEP process for ongoing improvement of the program as well as to inform each successive phase of the program. The process of examining and analyzing program results is one which demands time and resources. It also slows the development of successive phases. While many teacher education reforms are anxiously rushed into place, Portland State University and Beaverton and Portland school districts have urged the kind of thoughtful, long-term and collaborative research and development which has characterized the Cooperative Professional Education Program since its beginning. This characteristic of the CPEP model is considered most critical.

"The criticism that focused on American schools two years has come to rest on teacher education" (Warren, 1985). The shift from schools and classrooms to teacher preparation has occurred before and the pattern has been one of brief and temporary changes. As in the past, there is pressure to make changes, to improve the process of preparing teachers. The Cooperative Professional Education Program responds to the opportunity for change with commitments to thoughtful long-term

development and implementation. Warren summarized the history of teacher education and concluded that "teachers deserve preparation that conceptualizes and builds upon the broad scope of their actual responsibilities." This paper contends that CPEP provides what teachers deserve.

References

Buchmann, M. (1983). Justification in teacher thinking: An analysis of interview data, Research Series 124. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University, The Institute for Research on Teaching.

Carl, M. E. (1985). Cooperative Profession Education Program, phase one. Portland, OR: Portland State University.

Carl, M. E. & Montgomery, S. (1985). Cooperative Professional Education Program: Follow-up study. Portland, OR: Portland State University.

Clinton, H. R. (1985). Teacher education: Of the people, by the people, and for the people. Journal of Teacher Education, 36(1), 47-49.

Driscoll, A., Kauchak, D., & Peterson, K. (1986). Some recommendations for designing a district mentor system. Journal of Staff Development (in press).

Driscoll, A., Kauchak, D. & Stevens, D. (1986). The influence of research on effective instruction on student teachers' thoughts and behaviors. Paper to be presented at the annual conference of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, California.

Driscoll, A. & Shirey, D. C. (1985). Job satisfaction, professional concerns and communication patterns of teachers: Differences along the professional continuum. The Teacher Educator, 21(1), 2-14.

Fuller, F. (1969). Concerns of teachers: A developmental conceptualization. American Educational Research Journal, 6, 207-226.

Fuller, F. & Brown, O. (1975). On becoming a teacher. In K. Ryan (Ed.), Teacher Education. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Griffin, G. (1984). Supervision and evaluation in student teaching, induction, and inservice, Report No. 9054. Austin, TX: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas at Austin.

Hall, G. & Loucks, S. (1978). Teacher concerns as a basis for facilitating and personalizing staff development. Teachers College Record, 80(1), 36-53.

Howey, K. R. (1977). Preservice teacher education: Lost in the shuffle. Journal of Teacher Education, 28(2), 26-28.

Howey, K. R. & Gardner, W. (1983). The education of teachers: A look ahead. New York, NY: Longman Press.

Joint Committee on Teacher Education. (1982). Toward excellence in Oregon education. Salem, OR: Oregon Board of Education.

Joyce, B. & Clift, R. (1984). The Phoenix agenda: Essential reform in teacher education. Educational Researcher, 13(4), 5-18.

Katz, L. (1980). A matrix for research on teacher education. In E. Hoyle & J. Megarry (Eds.), The professional development of teachers. London: Kogan Page.

Koehler, V. (1985). Research on presservice teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education, 36(1), 23-30.

Lortie, D. (1975). School teacher. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Warren, D. (1985). Learning from experience: History and teacher education. Educational Researcher, 14(10), 5-12.

Zeichner, K. (1980). Myths and realities: Field-based experiences in preservice teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education, 31(6), 45-55.

Zimpher, N. L., de Voss, G. G., & Nott, D. L. (1980). A closer look at university student supervision. Journal of Teacher Education, 31(4), 11-15.